RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 27 2007

Serial No. 10/506,908

Docket No. 30882/DP018

REMARKS

This paper is presented in response to the final official action mailed April 27, 2007, in which claims 1-24 were rejected. By this amendment, claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 10, 23, and 24 are amended and claims 4, 6, and 8 are canceled. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 10, 23, and 24 may be found in the specification and claims as originally filed. For example, support for the amendment to claim 1 may be found in original claims 4, 6, and 8, and support for the amendment to claim 23 may be found in paragraph [0053] and claim 26 of the international application as originally filed. No new matter is added. As a result, claims 1-3, 5, 7, and 9-24 remain pending and at issue upon entry of this amendment.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

The applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-24 obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,987,140 to Rowney et al. ("Rowney"), in view of one or more of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0129238 to Toh ("Toh") and U.S. Patent No. 6,724,894 to Singer ("Singer"). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, "the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." M.P.E.P. § 2143. The cited art fails to disclose or suggest all claim limitations. In particular, each of claims 1-24 now recites, *inter alia*, a method (or device) of generating forgery-proof documents comprising irreversibly linking document data to key information, combining the document data and the key information to form at least one of a document and a data record, and transmitting the document or data record to a checking station.

Rowney discloses a method of generating a combined block that is encrypted using a random encryption key and encrypting the combined block using an encryption key RK-0 in a merchant computer system. The merchant computer system sends the encrypted combined block and the encryption key RK-0 to a payment gateway system. See Rowney, col. 13, lines 14-36. The payment gateway system decrypts the encryption key RK-0 and uses the encryption key RK-0 to decrypt the combined block. See Rowney, col. 13, lines 38-58. It is the examiner's position that the encryption key RK-0 of Rowney is the key information recited in the claims. See the official action, page 4, paragraph 11. However, the payment gateway system re-encrypts the combined block using new and random encryption keys RK-1 and RK-2. See Rowney, col. 14, lines 52-55 and col. 15, lines 11-14. The pending claims recite combining "the document data and the key information." Emphasis added. In other words, the key information recited in the claims is both transmitted to the cryptographic

7

PAGE 8/10 * RCVD AT 6/27/2007 11:24:17 AM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-3/10 * DNIS:2738311 * CSID:312 474 0448 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-38

Serial No. 10/506,908

Docket No. 30882/DP018

module and combined with the document data. Rowney, on the other hand, discloses transmitting one encryption key RK-0 to the payment gateway system and using another encryption key RK-1 and RK-2 to encrypt the combined block. Therefore, Rowney fails to disclose or suggest irreversibly linking document data to the key information, combining the document data and the key information to form at least one of a document and a data record, and transmitting the document or data record to a checking station, as is recited by each of claims 1-24.

Toh fails to disclose or suggest irreversibly linking document data to the key information, combining the document data and the key information to form at least one of a document and a data record, and transmitting the document or data record to a checking station, nor was Toh cited as disclosing these elements. Toh discloses a method for transmitting data from a sender to a recipient via a central operations center. However, key information is not transmitted from the sender to the recipient. Key information is only used for encrypting the data to be transmitted to the recipient. As a result, Toh fails to disclose or suggest using key information to form a document or data record, as is recited by each of claims 1-24.

Singer also fails to disclose or suggest irreversibly linking document data to the key information, combining the document data and the key information to form at least one of a document and a data record, and transmitting the document or data record to a checking station, nor was Singer cited as showing these elements. Singer discloses a cryptographic module and a method of operating the cryptographic module. However, Singer does not disclose or suggest transmitting encrypted key information and encrypted checking information. Thus, Singer fails to disclose or suggest irreversibly linking document data to the key information, combining the document data and the key information to form at least one of a document and a data record, and transmitting the document or data record to a checking station.

No combination of Rowney, Toh and Singer can render the pending claims obvious because Rowney, Toh and Singer fail to disclose or suggest each and every element recited in claims 1-24. For this reason, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-24.

8

PAGE 9/10 * RCVD AT 6/27/2007 11:24:17 AM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-3/10 * DNIS:2738311 * CSID:312 474 0448 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-38

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER JUN 2 7 2007

Serial No. 10/506,908

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, entry of the foregoing amendments and allowance of claims 1-24 is respectfully requested.

The applicants respectfully submit that the amendments do not raise new issues. In particular, the amendments to independent claim 1 simply incorporate the subject matter of canceled claims 4, 6, and 8, and thereby narrow the issues and put the application in better form for allowance or consideration on appeal.

Further, the amendments could not have been presented earlier, as the outstanding rejections were first raised in the most recent official action.

Should the examiner wish to discuss the foregoing, or any matter of form, in an effort to advance this application towards, allowance, the examiner is urged to telephone the undersigned at the indicated number.

> Respectfully submitted, MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

Bv:

June 27, 2007

Michael A. Chinlund Reg. No. 55,064 Agent for Applicants

6300 Sears Tower 233 South Wacker Drive Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357 (312) 474-6300

9

PAGE 10/10 * RCVD AT 6/27/2007 11:24:17 AM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-3/10 * DNIS:2738311 * CSID:312 474 0448 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-38